

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102 (e) or are obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103 (a). Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues resulting in adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at telephone number (650) 988-0655 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-9, 11-13, 40-41, 46-54, 56 and 57-58 are pending in this application. Claims 10, 14-39, 42-45 and 55 have been canceled. Claims 57-58 are new.

In the Drawings

In the amendment filed on September 21, 2007, replacement drawings were submitted. Subsequent Office Actions have not indicated that the replacement drawings were accepted or objected to. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner accept the replacement drawings submitted with the September 21, 2007 Office Action.

The Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-13, 40-41 and 46 are rejected under 35 USC § 102 (e) as being anticipated by the Graham patent (U.S. Patent No. 7,228,492).

In response, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 6, 8 and 9 to more particularly point out the invention.

Claim 1 includes the recitations of Claim 10. The rejection of Claim 10 admits that the Graham patent does not expressly disclose that the materialization entity is deleted automatically from the materialization area.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the Graham patent does not expressly or inherently disclose that in response to a concept of interest being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the corresponding concept indicator from the materialization area. Therefore, Applicants respectfully maintain that the Graham patent does not expressly or inherently disclose: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 1 is not anticipated by the Graham patent. Claims 2-9, 11-13, 40-41 and 46 depend from Claim 1 are not anticipated by the Graham patent for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being obvious over the Graham patent. As to Claim 10, the rejection admits that the Graham patent does not expressly disclose that the materialization entity is deleted automatically from the materialization area, or more specifically: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into the scrollable area, deleting automatically the materialization entity from the materialization area, wherein the materialization entity is not displayed in the materialization area. The rejection of Claim 10 then asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the removal of materialization entities automatically.

Claim 1 has the recitations of: presenting a first subset of information in a scrollable area, the first subset of information comprising, at least in part, a second subset of information, the second subset of information being designated as a materialization entity, wherein the materialization entity is not displayed in a materialization area; scrolling the scrollable area; in response to at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of view in the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity, at least in part, in the materialization area, wherein the materialization area is separate from the scrollable area; and in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

Applicants respectfully maintain that modifying the teachings of the Graham patent to remove concept indicators that correspond to concepts of interest from a concept area in response to a concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area renders the invention of the Graham patent unsuitable for its intended purpose. The Graham patent is directed to a document interest profiling method that helps the reader find the information he or she wants more quickly. (Graham patent, col. 1 lines 55-57).

In the Graham patent, selectable concept indicators 506 permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. If the teachings of the Graham patent are modified to remove a concept indicator from a concept area in response to the corresponding concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area, then that concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, could no longer be selected or deselected. To select a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is displayed in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll a document until the corresponding concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the corresponding concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and

manually select that corresponding concept indicator. Therefore, the selection of a concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, is made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to select a concept indicator and corresponding concept of interest is increased.

Using the asserted modification to the Graham patent, to deselect a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is in view in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll until that concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the corresponding concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually deselect that concept indicator. Therefore, de-selection of a concept indicator, and the corresponding concept of interest, is also made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to de-select a concept indicator and concept of interest is increased.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully maintain that the conclusion of being obvious is based on improper hindsight reasoning. The concept of dynamically removing materialization entities is taken directly from Applicants disclosure. The Graham patent does not teach automating the removal of a concept of interest from the list in response to being in viewable in the scrollable area. The Graham patent does not teach: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is not obvious over the Graham patent. Claims 2-9, 11-13, 40-41 and 46 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1, and are not obvious over the Graham patent for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 47-49 and 50-56 were rejected as being obvious over the Graham patent. In response Claims 47, 48, 49 and 50 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention.

As to independent Claim 47, the rejection admits that the Graham patent does not expressly disclose that the materialization entity is deleted automatically from the materialization area. The rejection then asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the removal of materialization entities automatically.

Claim 47 has been amended to recite: presenting information in a scrollable area; receiving a selection of a subset of the information; in response to receiving a create materialization entity activation, designating the subset of the information as a materialization entity; scrolling the scrollable area; in response to at least a portion of the materialization entity being scrolled out of view in the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity in a materialization area, wherein the materialization area is separate from the scrollable area; and in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

Applicants respectfully maintain that modifying the teachings of the Graham patent to remove concept indicators that correspond to concepts of interest from a concept area in response to a concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area renders the invention of the Graham patent unsuitable for its intended purpose. The Graham patent is directed to a document interest profiling method that helps the reader find the information he or she wants more quickly. (Graham patent, col. 1 lines 55-57).

In the Graham patent, selectable concept indicators 506 permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. If the teachings of the Graham patent are modified to remove a concept indicator from a concept area in response to the corresponding concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area, then that concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, could no longer be selected or deselected. To select a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is displayed in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll a document until the corresponding concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the corresponding concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually select that corresponding concept indicator. Therefore, the selection of a concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, is made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to select a concept indicator and corresponding concept of interest is increased.

Using the asserted modification to the Graham patent, to deselect a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is in view in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll until that concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the corresponding concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually deselect that concept indicator. Therefore, de-selection of a concept indicator, and the corresponding concept of interest, is also made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to de-select a concept indicator and concept of interest is increased.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully maintain that the conclusion of being obvious is based on improper hindsight reasoning. The concept of dynamically removing materialization entities is taken directly from Applicants disclosure. The Graham patent does not teach automating the removal of a concept of interest from the list in response to

being in viewable in the scrollable area. The Graham patent does not teach: in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

For the foregoing reasons, Claim 47 is not obvious. Claims 48-49 depend from Claim 47, and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 47.

Claim 50 has the recitations of: displaying a first subset of information in a scrollable area, the first subset of information comprising a tagged information, the tagged information being a materialization entity, wherein the tagged information is not displayed in a materialization area; scrolling the scrollable area; in response to the tagged information being scrolled out of view in the scrollable area, displaying the tagged information, at least in part, in the materialization area, the materialization area being separate from the scrollable area; and in response to the tagged information being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the tagged information from the materialization area, wherein the tagged information is not displayed in the materialization area.

Applicants respectfully maintain that modifying the teachings of the Graham patent to remove concept indicators that correspond to concepts of interest from a concept area in response to a concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area renders the invention of the Graham patent unsuitable for its intended purpose. The Graham patent is directed to a document interest profiling method that helps the reader find the information he or she wants more quickly. (Graham patent, col. 1 lines 55-57).

In the Graham patent, selectable concept indicators 506 permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. If the teachings of

the Graham patent are modified to remove a concept indicator from a concept area in response to the corresponding concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area, then that concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, could no longer be selected or deselected. To select a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is displayed in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll a document until the corresponding concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the corresponding concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually select that corresponding concept indicator. Therefore, the selection of a concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, is made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to select a concept indicator and corresponding concept of interest is increased.

Using the asserted modification to the Graham patent, to deselect a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is in view in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll until that concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the corresponding concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually deselect that concept indicator. Therefore, de-selection of a concept indicator, and the corresponding concept of interest, is also made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to de-select a concept indicator and concept of interest is increased.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully maintain that the conclusion of being obvious is based on improper hindsight reasoning. The concept of dynamically removing tagged information is taken directly from Applicants disclosure. The Graham patent does not teach automating the removal of a concept of interest from the list in response to being in viewable in the scrollable area. The Graham patent does not teach: in response

to the tagged information being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the tagged information from the materialization area.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 50 is not obvious. Claims 51-54 and 56 depend from Claim 50, and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 50.

New Claims 57-58

New Independent Claim 57 is also not anticipated by or obvious over the Graham patent. Independent Claim 57 has the following recitations: displaying a subset of information of a file in a scrollable area, wherein a portion of the subset of information that is displayed is designated as a materialization entity; scrolling the scrollable area; in response to the materialization entity being scrolled out of view in the scrollable area, displaying the materialization entity in a materialization area, the materialization area being different from the scrollable area; and in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area.

Because new Claim 57 recites in response to the materialization entity being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the materialization entity from the materialization area, Applicants respectfully maintain that Claim 57 is not anticipated by the Graham patent. Claim 58 depends from Claim 57 and is not anticipated by the Graham patent for the same reasons as Claim 57.

Applicants respectfully maintain that modifying the teachings of the Graham patent to remove concept indicators that correspond to concepts of interest from a concept area in response to a concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area renders the invention of the Graham patent unsuitable for its intended

purpose. The Graham patent is directed to a document interest profiling method that helps the reader find the information he or she wants more quickly. (Graham patent, col. 1 lines 55-57).

In the Graham patent, selectable concept indicators 506 permit the user to identify which concepts of interest are to be noted in the document. If the teachings of the Graham patent are modified to remove a concept indicator from a concept area in response to the corresponding concept of interest being scrolled into view in the scrollable area, then that concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, could no longer be selected or deselected. To select a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is displayed in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll a document until the corresponding concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the corresponding concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually select that corresponding concept indicator. Therefore, the selection of a concept indicator, and corresponding concept of interest, is made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to select a concept indicator and corresponding concept of interest is increased.

Using the asserted modification to the Graham patent, to deselect a concept indicator corresponding to a concept of interest that is in view in the scrollable area, the user would have to scroll until that concept of interest is out of view in the scrollable area and the concept indicator appears in the concept area, which may not even be possible if the corresponding concept of interest appears frequently throughout the document, and manually deselect that concept indicator. Therefore, de-selection of a concept indicator, and the corresponding concept of interest, is also made more complex and difficult, and the amount of effort and time for a user to de-select a concept indicator and concept of interest is increased.

Docket No.: SVL920030143US1
Application No. 10/815,430
Amendment Submitted on August 15, 2008
In response to Non-Final Office Action of July 1, 2008

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully maintain that the conclusion of being obvious is based on improper hindsight reasoning. The concept of dynamically removing tagged information is taken directly from Applicants disclosure. The Graham patent does not teach automating the removal of a concept of interest from the list in response to being in viewable in the scrollable area. The Graham patent does not teach: in response to the tagged information being scrolled back into view in the scrollable area, removing the tagged information from the materialization area.


For the foregoing reasons Claim 57 is not obvious over the Graham patent. Claim 58 depends from Claim 57 and is not obvious over the Graham patent for the same reasons as Claim 57.

Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

August 15, 2008



Janet M. Skafar, Attorney
Reg. No. 41,315
Correspondence Customer No. 55070
Telephone: (650)988-0655
Facsimile: (408) 463-4827